

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

THERESA A. MUMFORD, *et al.*,  
Plaintiffs,  
vs.  
WAL-MART STORES, INC.,  
Defendant.

Case No. 2:14-cv-00787-GMN-CWH

## ORDER

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel Discovery, Extend Discovery Deadline, and Order Defendant to Produce John Eberhardt for Deposition (doc. # 17), filed December 23, 2014.

After careful review, the Court finds that Plaintiffs' motion to compel must be denied for failure to comply with Local Rule 26-7(a). Local Rule 26-7(a) requires a discovery motion to "set forth in full the text of the discovery originally sought and the response thereto, if any." Loc.Civ.R. 26-7(a). However, Plaintiffs fail to provide the complete text of requests, along with Defendant's specific discovery responses, in the body of the motion. Plaintiffs also do not bother to link their arguments to the complete text of requests and to Defendant's specific discovery responses. Instead, Plaintiffs have simply attached their requests and Defendant's prior discovery responses as exhibits. Plaintiffs appear to be operating under the misconception that it is the judiciary's responsibility to sift through scattered papers and identify viable claims and arguments. The Court dispels Plaintiffs' misconception with this order. Moreover, this Court refuses to entertain Plaintiffs' other requests, as they are presented in violation of Special Order 109, which requires that a separate document be filed for each separate purpose.

Based on the foregoing and good cause appearing therefore, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel Discovery, Extend Discovery Deadline, and Order Defendant to Produce John Eberhardt for Deposition (doc. # 17) is **denied without prejudice**.

DATED: January 6, 2015

*Cres H*

**C.W. Hoffman, Jr.  
United States Magistrate Judge**